UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,032	07/08/2003	Chongyang Wang	9896-000004	3948
2,0,0	7590 01/24/200 CKEY & PIERCE, P.L	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 828			SINGH, DALZID E	
BLOOMFIELD	O HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MOI	NTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/615,032	WANG ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit .			
		Dalzid Singh	2613			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication aportion appears to the communication appears to the communication appears to the communication appears to the communication	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIII - External Exte	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [ ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depend for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[\]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 131	November 2006.				
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□						
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims	•				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 7 is/are rejected.					
7)🖂	Claim(s) <u>3,5 and 6</u> is/are objected to.	-				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers		•			
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	u)-(d) or (f).			
,	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer		tion No.			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price					
	application from the International Burea					
* ;	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	at of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachmer	nt(s)					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal R				
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2613

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramaswami et al (US Patent No. 6,947,623).

Regarding claim 1, Ramaswami et al method for data-flow protection of an optical interface in a protected device, (see Figs. 8 and 9 ) comprising the steps of:

- (1) receiving an optical signal from a source-neighboring device by the protected device (Fig. 9, splitter (620) receives optical signal);
- (2) duplicating the optical signal into at least two duplicated optical signals (the signal is split which is considered as duplicating):

a first duplicated optical signal (bottom arrow) and a second duplicated opticalsignal (top arrow), and sending the first duplicated optical signal to a protected device for processing (redundant optical switch core is considered as the protected device), and sending directly the second duplicated optical signal to be selected (the optical switch receives the second optical signal to be selected); Application/Control Number: 10/615,032

Art Unit: 2613

(3) according to working status of the protected device, selecting one from the second duplicated optical-signal and output optical-signal of the protected device, and sending the selected one to a destination-neighboring device (see col. 9, lines 56-67 to col. 10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 2, wherein step (3) comprises, if working status signal output of the protected device is normal, then selecting optical signal output of the protected device and sending to the destination-neighboring device; if the protected device working status in step (3) is abnormal, then selecting the second duplicated optical-signal and sending to the destination-neighboring device (see col. 9, lines 56-67 to col. 10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 4, Ramaswami et al disclose a data-flow protection device of an optical interface in a protected device (shown in Fig. 8 and 9), comprising:

a first optical-signal duplicating unit (620) and an optical-signal selecting unit (2:1 optical switch);

wherein an input of the first optical-signal duplicating unit is connected to a source-neighboring device for receiving an optical-signal (there must be source neighboring device which transmit the signal), one output of the first optical-signal duplicating unit is directly connected to one input of the optical-signal selecting unit, another output of the first optical-signal duplicating unit connects to input of a protected device (redundant optical switch core is considered as the protected device); wherein another input of the optical-signal selecting unit is connected to optical-signal

Application/Control Number: 10/615,032

Art Unit: 2613

output of the protected device, the control end of the optical-signal selecting unit is connected with working status signal output of the protected device, the output of the optical-signal selecting unit connects to a destination-neighboring device (see col. 9, lines 56-67 to col. 10, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 7, in Fig. 9, Ramaswami et al show that the optical-signal duplication unit is an optical splitter (620), and the optical-signal selecting unit is an optical switch (2:1 optical switch).

## Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3, 5 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 23 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On the remark pages 6-7, applicant indicates that the protected device functions not as a backup device but as a transmission device. The protected device (redundant optical switch) of Ramaswami receives and transmit optical signal, therefore it functions as a transmission device. Further applicant indicates that signals from the source-neighboring devices must be processed, in operation such as protocol conversion,

Art Unit: 2613

routing and etc., by the protected device. Such limitation is not found in the claim. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features (i.e., as protocol conversion, routing and etc.) of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

On page 7 of the remark, applicant indicates that switch status signal and switch control signals are generated in the I/O port rather than in the redundant optical switch core. Applicant further indicates that switch status signals and switch control signals are generated at the destination receiving side. However such limitation are not found in the claim. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

#### Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalzid Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3029. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/615,032

Art Unit: 2613

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DS January 19, 2007

DALZID SINGH PRIMARY EXAMINER